

REMARKS

The Examiner has finally rejected the claims of the present application asserting claims 1 and 7 to be anticipated by Shonnard '771; claims 1-4 and 6 to be anticipated by Margles '427; claims 1-3 to be anticipated by Reo '678; and claim 5 to be unpatentable over Margles '427. Responsive to the rejections, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to further and more precisely define the invention and to clarify its distinguishing differences from the prior art.

In particular, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the handrail is reversed by a drivable reversing sheave having a periphery in driving contact with the handrail. It is that periphery which is also contacted by a drive wheel which drives the reversing sheave. None of the prior art of record teaches or suggests such a construction, in which a reversing wheel periphery is both in driving contact with the handrail and is driven by contact with a drive wheel.

Shonnard '771 shows a drivable reversing sheave 30 whose periphery drives the handrail. The Examiner asserts that Shonnard inherently includes a drive means to power the sheave 30 via a belt drive. Such a belt drive is not a drive wheel in contact with the reversing sheave periphery. Indeed, use of the belt drive at the belt handrail-driving periphery of the reversing sheave would appear to be an impossibility. Further, Figure 1 of Shonnard suggests that the belt drive is effected through a smaller pulley concentric with, but clearly separate and remote from, the handrail driving periphery of the sheave.

Margles '427 shows a similar construction, in which drivable reversing sheave 30 has a periphery in driving contact with the handrail, but also a separate pulley 26 for driving the reversing sheave. Clearly, it neither has nor teaches a sheave drive wheel in contact with the reversing sheave periphery.

Lastly, Figure 2A of Reo '678 depicts a drive construction in which the reversing sheave does not drive the handrail. Rather, the handrail is driven by an auxiliary sheave located below the reversing sheave. While the auxiliary sheave has a periphery in driving contact with the handrail it is itself driven by a concentric pulley 13, driven by belt 14. Once again, the reversing

sheave periphery is not driven by a drive wheel in contact therewith. Indeed, the auxiliary sheave of Reo '678 is also not driven by a drive wheel in contact with a periphery that is also in driving contact with the handrail.

None of the references teach or even suggest the invention as presently claimed which recites a reversing sheave periphery which both is in driving contact with the handrail and is in driven contact with a drive wheel. Accordingly, the present invention is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by the art of record and passage to allowance is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEITZER CORNMAN GROSS & BONDELL LLP
Customer No. 022831
Attorneys For Applicant
292 Madison Avenue – 19th Floor
New York, NY 10017
(646) 424-0770

JAB/cw

BY


JAY A. BONDELL, ESQ., REG. #28,188

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 C.F.R. 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA. 22313-1450, on July 22, 2005.

Carol L. Wood, Sender 